

CHP Evaluation meeting 1-6-06

The data indicates that the program will likely not meet the goal of making one home visit per household per year by the end of year two (Sept. 20 2006).

The data indicates that a lot of residents still don't know about the program.

While Jay didn't have this data available, he said he can get data that shows that this neighborhood has many transient households, which might justify an additional year to better the odds of contacting new renters in the area. (This was a point that Jim Weaver was looking for data to support).

To some, the data showed that a low percentage of the residents had an awareness of exterior/interior lead paint issues, so a third year of contact might help improve that awareness. To some others, those same numbers seemed like a higher than expected number of residents were aware of these issues.

The data showed that a great number of people don't know what their sampling results are.

Some in the meeting thought that a low percentage of people knew what pica behavior was. Others in the meeting thought that the same data showed a surprisingly high percentage from what they would expect.

Martha and Jay said that they were just beginning the representative evaluation visits, and more information about behavioral changes brought about from the home visits would be available after these visits.

Clinics:

Everyone agreed that the CHP workers brought the most people in to the clinics, so they are key in any outreach for future clinics.

Only 22 percent of the kids screened at CHP clinics in 2005 had been screened before elsewhere, so the CHP clinics are reaching a population who might not get screened elsewhere.

Though some clinics had very low attendance, overall the CHP clinics screened approx. 500 kids. Martha said that DHHA screened approx. 1,000 in Denver as a whole, so the group noted that the CHP clinics were actually useful overall.

There weren't many elevated blood – lead results, indicating there may not be a widespread problem. On the other hand, not many kids were tested who were younger than four, indicating there was no data for that group and that future clinics may be necessary if outreach concentrated on that age group.

Arsenic testing may not be useful in the third year because the soil will be cleaned up and there are not many other sources of arsenic out there. Jane Mitchell suggested that we just test kids for arsenic who live on properties between 47 ppm and 70ppm (because 47 ppm is supposedly the risk level for soil pica kids, and of course, we did not clean up soils below 70ppm).